

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

June 10, 2002

6:00 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

Mayor Baines called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Wihby.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll. There were fourteen Aldermen present.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Guinta, Sysyn, Osborne, Pinard, O’Neil,
Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault, Forest

4. Appropriating Resolutions:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Aggregation Program the sum of \$764,816 from Aggregation Fees for the fiscal Year 2003.”

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$41,938,254 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for Fiscal Year 2003.”

“A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$2,686,167 from Recreation User Charges to the Recreation Division for Fiscal Year 2003.”

“A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$13,941,680 from Sewer User Rental Charges to the Environmental Protection Division for Fiscal Year 2003.”

“Appropriating all Incremental Meals and Rooms Tax Revenue Received by the City in Fiscal Year 2002 and held in the Civic Center Fund, for the payment of the City’s Obligations in Said Fiscal Year Under the Financing Agreement.”

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted that the Appropriating Resolutions be read by titles only, and it was so done.

Alderman O’Neil moved that the Appropriating Resolutions pass and be Enrolled.

Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

5. Appropriating Resolutions:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating to the Central Business Service District the sum of \$205,833 from Central Business Service District Funds for the Fiscal Year 2003’ to \$225,000.”

“Continuation of the Central Business Service District.”

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted that the Appropriating Resolutions be read by titles only, and it was so done.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated at the last meeting of the Board we discussed the Central Business Service District resolution, the Continuation...we did review it with the City Solicitor’s Office and the Finance Officer and have discussed it as well with Mr. MacKenzie of the Planning Department. The resolution would need to be amended to the \$.64 cents tax rate because the Board does need to set a tax rate and at a later date it is suggested that the ordinance that relates to this be reviewed in order to accommodate it better for the district.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the Continuation resolution to the \$.64 cents tax rate.

Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe last year was the year that we reduced that, if I remember correctly, and it was a gone of contention to reduce that money that was presently on the table. Now, I don’t know why we’re increasing it because I was under the understanding that that was put in place to get most of Elm Street filled. Now, the second floors look like they’re filling, the third floors look like they’re filling...I don’t know why we’re going to continue increasing the tax rate to people Downtown.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would just note that the \$.64 cents is tied to the \$225,000 that is being appropriated whether or not the Board wishes to appropriate that amount is a

separate question, but if the \$225,000 stands then the \$.64 cents rate has to be set according to the Assessors' records.

Alderman DeVries stated I was just going to make a point for Alderman Gatsas, I believe the \$25,000 increase in that was tied to increased expenses for rental at the facility.

Mayor Baines stated that's what was explained at the last meeting.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm a great believer that Elm Street has certainly come a long way and Intown has done a great job, but I think that Elm Street is part of this entire City...to just take the people on Elm Street and say or a distinct area of Elm Street that goes down to Canal Street and into the Millyard and say we're going to charge you a little bit more because we're going to bring you a little bit more, I think that the venue that was on Hanover Street this weekend was a part of the City, it wasn't just Hanover Street. I think that every taxpayer in this City enjoys what they saw and I don't think that it should be just hammered away with people that are in that district.

Alderman O'Neil stated I do share some of Alderman Gatsas' concerns because we did spend a considerable amount of time a year ago trying to get the district downsized and I guess the direction we're going though is a budget gets set in which we have no say and we get stuck raising the tax rate on it and I believe that is what we're doing, correct, to meet a number.

Alderman Guinta stated that is correct, however, the members of the Board of Intown Manchester had a meeting back in either February or March and essentially agreed to this self-imposed tax. So, while we are charged with the responsibility from an ordinance standpoint of ratifying this (for lack of a better term) the members of the Central Business District, in large part, have already approved and agreed to this several month's ago.

Mayor Baines stated I would also like to remind you that Intown went through something they were required to do this past year to get the vote of the people that were impacted and it was overwhelmingly in favor of continuing the support through Intown process.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you for that clarification. I am just a little concerned that somehow this falls back in our lap when they increase the budget, therefore, the rate has to change and that falls in our laps, so I know one of their major increases was rent, they had received free rent for a number of years, but I just want to caution they have to control their spending a little bit to keep the budget under control, thank you.

Alderman Garrity stated I'd just like to bring up a point about the tax rate for the folks Downtown. I was walking Downtown this morning and there were two folks with Intown Manchester T-shirts picking up garbage. The Highway Department doesn't pick-up garbage on Calef Road or up Gold Street or down South Beech Street, they just don't walk and pick-up garbage; that comes with a cost and people have to realize that.

Mayor Baines interjected they've indicated they're willing to pay for that extra service.

Alderman Wihby stated the Intown Board voted on this.

Mayor Baines replied yes the Intown Board.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion to amend the Continuation resolution. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman DeVries moved that the Appropriating Resolutions pass and be Enrolled with the second one as amended. Duly seconded by Alderman Osborne. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

6. Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Transit Authority the sum of \$725,000 for the Fiscal Year 2003.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted that the MTA Appropriating Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted we did distribute a communication in relation to this from the Transit Authority actually in relation to a question that was raised at the last meeting.

Alderman Wihby asked do I take this letter to mean that they're funding replacement buses with the \$500,000 that they're saying that they want from schools, I think they went up and they're saying they want to fund the additional bus replacements out of the \$500,000 going to schools.

Mr. Smith replied the two budgets are separate. The current resolution is dealing with their funded budget.

Alderman Wihby interjected I'm talking about this letter basically.

Mr. Smith stated the School budget is self-supporting and is separate.

Alderman Wihby stated this \$500,000 that you're talking about when someone questions this...that's \$500,000 that the School Department said they needed for funding for MTA, is that true?

Mr. Smith replied that is the outside estimate, Sir.

Alderman Wihby stated that's the number they gave us that that is what is was going to cost for MTA.

Mr. Smith stated I didn't understand the question.

Alderman Wihby stated the School Department gives us a budget and in their budget they said that the MTA expense was going up and it was going to be \$500,000. Now, we have a letter justifying the \$500,000 as an outside expense, but it sounds like \$300,000 of that or so is for replacement of buses.

Mr. Smith stated about \$200,000 is the estimate to increase the operating costs for 14 buses. Currently, we're operating about 46-47 buses and the estimate is that we would operate 60 under the rosters that were furnished to us. It's possible that we can reduce that number. As well, our Operating agreement with the School District each year includes a provision for vehicle replacement, that's true.

Alderman Wihby stated if you could just answer the question. How many new buses did you quote in the \$500,000 that...did you know that they gave us a \$500,000 increase, they told us they were spending?

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Alderman Wihby asked in that \$500,000 they wanted how many new buses? Originally, fourteen new bus routes.

Mr. Smith replied that is new additional routes although we have a fleet to support that. We do need to replace buses though. Our average fleet age is 7.7...

Alderman Wihby asked how much is the school bus transportation going up from last year to this new budget that we're making.

Mr. Smith replied we have not concluded negotiations with them, Sir.

Alderman Wihby asked how did they get a number of \$500,000 that they put in their budget?

Mayor Baines interjected let me answer...the day we attended the meeting the MTA did an analysis and in talking to all of the schools about the number of routes that would have to be added, a number of them are parochial school routes and in other words to serve all of the kids it ended up with 14 new routes or something like that, Dave.

Mr. Smith replied an estimate of 14 more daily bus routes.

Alderman Wihby stated in the last paragraph it says that after determining the daily rate the School District requested the MTA to reduce the number of buses and they were reduced by seven.

Mr. Smith stated that was last year's numbers.

Alderman Wihby stated so this year's numbers...you anticipate adding fourteen new buses to the school route.

Mr. Smith replied at the most, yes.

Alderman Wihby stated and that fourteen is costing around an extra \$100,000.

Mr. Smith stated the operating costs for those fourteen buses will be approximately \$200,000.

Alderman Wihby reiterated \$200,000 for the 14 extra routes.

Mr. Smith replied that is correct.

Alderman Wihby stated so the other \$300,000 is for replacement of school buses.

Mr. Smith stated yes, Sir, and also to overcome the operating deficit this year.

Alderman Wihby asked are you going to be charging them that? When you do your numbers are you going to charge them for the operating deficit this year?

Mr. Smith replied no, we would be unable to replace buses this year.

Alderman Wihby stated so the \$300,000 is then for additional buses...

Mr. Smith replied to avoid running an operating deficit and to replace buses.

Alderman Wihby asked what is the operating deficit, how much?

Mr. Smith replied currently at year-end April it was about \$167,000.

Alderman Wihby stated that's just for schools.

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Alderman Wihby stated so just to break even this year you would have needed \$167,000 more and then an additional fourteen routes is another \$200,000...so, \$367,000 is to breakeven...fourteen new routes plus the deficit.

Mr. Smith stated I'm not sure if I understand how you're putting it.

Alderman Wihby stated if you lost \$167,000, you have every right to make it back this year and if you're going to add fourteen new routes and it costs \$200,000 then that's an additional \$367,000 you'll be charging them at least that amount this year coming up in their new budget. And, the other money you're going to figure on is \$130,000 of replacement vehicles.

Mr. Smith replied yes, I think we had planned on replacing a minimum of two buses next year that would be \$110,000.

Alderman Wihby asked how about other buses on the City side, did we replace any buses on the City side?

Mr. Smith replied no.

Alderman Wihby stated we're replacing two on the school side, but none on the City side.

Mr. Smith replied correct.

Alderman Wihby asked do you know for a fact that they're going to...did they have to decide on replacing those buses? In the middle of next week can they call you up and say okay, we don't want fourteen new routes and we don't want to replace the buses?

Mr. Smith replied the two issues are somewhat separate. We have the ability to run those fourteen buses now, however, we need to reduce the average fleet age over time and to control that and without replacing buses the average fleet age will go too high.

Alderman Wihby stated my question is can they call you next week and tell you they don't want to spend \$150,000 on two new buses or is that something that you are going to tell them that you have to do?

Mr. Smith replied yes, that will be included in our negotiations with the School District. They could determine that they don't want any new buses.

Alderman Wihby asked are you going to tell them that they have to have it?

Mr. Smith replied I would tell them they should have them, but...

Mayor Baines interjected they're in negotiations.

Alderman Thibault of the fourteen new buses that you are going to have to put on does that include the salaries of those drivers?

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Alderman Thibault stated I was just talking to one of the commissioners this morning and he was telling me about how you're going from 47 to 60 buses or 61 buses, so I was just wondering if the drivers were included in that figure according to what Alderman Wihby was asking, thank you.

Alderman Garrity stated, David, on page 2 of your communication...second to the last paragraph...MTA and Manchester School District need to jointly agree on long-term plans for vehicle replacement. If the School District goes out and contracts with Laidlaw or someone else, I don't think they have to negotiate vehicle replacement. It's a contract that they pay you for a service. Are we talking that the School District has to come up with a plan to contribute to replacing vehicles with the MTA.

Mr. Smith stated the services provided by the MTA was established to be self-supporting. In other words, it was not to be supported with any tax funds other than provided through the contract with the School District. The vehicles must be replaced...the average...

Alderman Garrity interjected I don't doubt that, Sir, that the vehicles have to be replaced. My concern is if the School District negotiates with Laidlaw or some other firm, I don't think vehicle replacement is in that contract.

Mr. Smith stated typically those contracts include a maximum fleet age.

Alderman Garrity stated I've looked at a couple of School District contracts for the MTA and no where in there did it say anything about vehicle replacements or anything like that. Do you have an estimated cost of the cost to the School District to replace vehicles/buses?

Mr. Smith replied a bus currently costs about \$55,000.

Alderman Garrity asked the number of buses you want to replace, I probably missed it the last time.

Mr. Smith replied for next year (originally) two buses.

Alderman Garrity asked the School District has to pick up that cost?

Mr. Smith replied that would be included in the rate, yes.

Alderman Garrity stated I would strongly urge that the School District go out and see if they can find another contractor...Laidlaw or something like that and see if they can find a cheaper price.

Alderman Wihby stated the \$1.614 million in revenue that comes from what the School Department pays you...the bottom of the letter, did you sign this letter?

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Alderman Wihby stated it says "in 2001 the revenue was \$1.614 million...", that's from the School Department?

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Alderman Wihby asked, your Honor, is that their budget?

Mayor Baines replied that's included in their budget and that's something that they've included in their bottom line.

Alderman Wihby asked is that like our money when we give them their total budget...is there other revenue from someplace else?

Mayor Baines asked what are the additional revenues, Dave. Are there any other additional revenues beyond that?

Mr. Smith replied the School contract, as I said, is self-supporting. Last year, the cost including vehicle replacement was \$1.6 million and currently this year we expect about \$1.390 million.

Alderman Wihby asked self-supporting meaning they get money from the schools or do they get the money some other way?

Mayor Baines replied no, they get the money from the schools.

Alderman Wihby stated which is our bottom line number.

Mayor Baines stated that is part of what they have to deal with in their appropriation is whatever their costs are for transportation.

Alderman Thibault moved that the MTA Appropriating Resolution ought to pass and be enrolled. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Forest duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Gatsas stated for the record on the motion for the Intown tax rate, I said I was in opposition, I must abstain rather than being opposed for the record.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked can we just clarify, did you want to be recorded as abstaining from both resolutions?

Alderman Gatsas replied yes.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk will make that correction.

7. Appropriating Resolutions:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School Food and Nutrition Services program the sum of \$4,750,000 from School Food and Nutrition Services Revenues for Fiscal Year 2003.”

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$121,148,267 for the Fiscal Year 2003.”

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted that the School District Appropriating Resolutions be read by titles only, and it was so done.

Alderman Lopez moved that the School District Appropriating Resolutions pass and be enrolled. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Shea and Garrity duly recorded in opposition.

8. Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘Raising Monies and Making Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2003’ to \$104,202,710.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman O’Neil, it was voted that the Appropriating Resolutions be read by title only, and it was so done.

Mayor Baines stated everyone has seen the letter from the Public Health Director.

Alderman Osborne moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be enrolled.

Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated we’re voting on the budget today, right. Your Honor, again, the last time we had a meeting you had used \$750,000 for the parking garage. In the past whenever we have decided to do something like that we have always either gone through an ordinance or had it done or whatever, even when we did the parking fees we had done that. Your

Honor, I think it is just appropriate that this Board vote, right now, that they are going to use that \$750,000 for the parking garage rather than doing the thing that's the right thing to do and not use it and put it in our budget because it is a one-time sale and either use it for economic development or put it in a fund to do something else with it later. What we're saying by passing this today is that this Board is going to be voting to put the \$750,000 into the budget, reducing the budget and using that one-time additional fee.

Mayor Baines stated first of all the City Solicitor will clarify...all we're voting on tonight is the expenditure budget tonight. The decisions related to the garages and everything would have to be a separate action when that happens, am I correct on that, Mr. Clark?

City Solicitor Clark replied you're voting on the expenditure budget, you don't appropriate revenues, you're estimating revenues in your budget.

Mayor Baines stated that decision that we could have a discussion at some other time with the Finance Officer at the next meeting or subsequent meetings when we find out what's going to happen with the garage(s) and actually decide that issue at that time.

Alderman Wihby asked, your Honor, are you in favor of taking the \$750,000 from the garage selling it and putting it toward the budget?

Mayor Baines replied I have some concerns about that number.

Alderman Wihby stated why don't we just be fair to the taxpayer and tell them that they're getting a 9% increase next year and not an eight.

Mayor Baines stated we're not going to know...again, I'll repeat for you and for the public, we are not setting the tax rate with this budget. We set the tax rate in the fall. In the fall when we get closer to the time when we go to the DRA and Mr. Clougherty can correct me...Mr. Clougherty has sat down and he has reviewed the numbers and made a judgment

that he feels he can come into me and say these are the revenues that we feel that we can go to the DRA on, am I correct on that, Mr. Clougherty?

Mr. Clougherty replied every November we come to the Mayor's Office and decisions about revenues are reviewed with the Mayor's Office, decisions about fund balances are the domain of the Board, they make that decision in November.

Alderman Thibault stated some new information...as Chairman of Lands and Buildings, your Honor, some new information has gotten to me just today. I wondered if we should table this and relook at this. There are some questions now that have come up that I really believe we should really look at it before we just sell these garages.

Mayor Baines stated we can decide that at a subsequent meeting, we do not need to decide that tonight and I would ask for the support of the majority of the Board to pass the budget and let's deal with the revenue issue related to the garage at another time where we can sit down and discuss exactly what we want to do, that is what I would recommend.

Alderman Thibault stated so in other words, your Honor, you're not assuming that we're going to sell the garages.

Mayor Baines replied no because I think there are going to be some issues.

Alderman Gatsas stated the number that obviously put us where we're at because I know that we're just talking about the expenditure side and, your Honor, I heard you a week ago eloquently speak about 1999 and the Claremont money and how that money went to reducing the tax rate...eloquently you spoke about that and you didn't have that opportunity...that if you had the opportunity you would have put those funds in a separate account. Your Honor, you've had that opportunity with your budget here...you arbitrarily took \$750,000 to reduce taxes. So, in essence, you had the opportunity to take those funds, if you wanted to and not arbitrarily put them towards the deficit or the increase in taxes that would have been 9%...you showed a \$750,000 revenue that showed an 8% increase in taxes.

So, your Honor, I would say this is no different than Claremont, I think that those funds should not be allocated for reducing taxes on a one shot time because we all know that once that happens that that increase is going to be upon us next year.

Mayor Baines stated I agree with you to this extent and that...first of all, it's not exactly the same as Claremont...Claremont we're talking about \$30 million, here we're talking about a potential of \$750,000 and a majority of the Aldermen worked and supported that notion that we need to look at some additional revenue sources. A final decision on that, I agree, would have to be a separate action by the Board and again we are dealing with some evolving information regarding the garages, I think we should step back from that issue. We do not actually, by law, set revenue...we're only passing an expenditure budget this evening and I would ask the Board to move on from this and deal with the issue of the revenues, especially as they relate to the garage at a separate time; that is what I am recommending.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think that every Board member should understand, I think that they should understand that we should pull that out and the increase that they're voting for, the expenditure that they're voting for is a 9% increase, that is what they should understand they're voting for.

Mayor Baines stated no, we calculated today, it would be about 8.7% or something like that, in that vicinity.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why you calculated it?

Mayor Baines replied I think there are some legitimate issues to consider regarding that but I believe the expenditure budget is a sound budget. As we stated it's also going to cause some cutbacks in services and as you've heard from the Health Department already, you'll be hearing from other departments...I think the expenditure budget this Board has weighed in and I would urge us to move the question and move on.

Alderman Lopez stated I could also say the same thing about taking a million out of the rainy day fund, so it's a moot question...move the question, please. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion to move the question.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion to move the question.

Alderman Wihby stated I don't know why we have to be afraid to have input on a 9% tax increase.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to move the question. Aldermen Wihby voted nay.

Alderman Gatsas stated a parliamentary question, your Honor. If I vote no on the parliamentary question, does that mean that I would be voting yes for a 9%...

Mayor Baines replied no you would simply be leaving the discussion open; that is all we're doing is whether or not we are going to close discussion and move for a vote on the budget; that is all this question is.

Roll call vote continued as follows: Aldermen Gatsas, Guinta, Sysyn, Shea, and Garrity voted nay. Aldermen Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault and Forest voted yea. The motion carried.

Mayor Baines asked for clarification from the Clerk on the question now on the floor.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the motion on the floor at this time is...Alderman Osborne, by Alderman Pinard that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be enrolled.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to Enroll the Resolution. Aldermen Gatsas, Guinta, Sysyn, Shea, Garrity and Wihby voted nay. Aldermen Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Smith, Thibault and Forest voted yea. The motion carried.

TABLED ITEM

9. Report of the Committee on Finance advising that it has directed City staff to explore Harrington as a health insurance provider and begin putting complete numbers together July 1st with a full report due to the Board of Mayor and aldermen by January 1, 2003.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove item 9 from the table for discussion.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated at the last meeting the Board tabled this report of the Committee on Finance directing staff of the HR Department to look into Harrington regarding health insurance numbers and there is a resolution in the next item related to this report and I would have you open the discussion on the report as to whether the Board wishes to accept that report...primarily, it was discussion as to what amount would be needed to hire a consultant.

Mayor Baines asked can we just receive and file and deal with it in the course of events with the rest of the agenda?

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied if you receive and file it technically she hasn't been directed to do anything and I think that was the intent of the Board, so I guess a motion to accept the report...with the understanding that the \$30,000 is the amount that is going to be tied to that committee report.

Mayor Baines stated why don't we just receive and file it...

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated right now the report is telling City staff to go do something, if you don't accept that report you haven't told them to do anything.

Alderman Lopez moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Finance.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Guinta stated just so I'm clear, voting on the report is not appropriating any funds?

Mayor Baines indicated you're going to deal with that down the line.

Alderman Gatsas stated there was a tabled item that we had on the Committee on Finance three weeks ago and I don't see it appearing before us.

Mayor Baines stated let's deal with this motion right now.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion to accept the report of the committee on Finance. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated you can bring up your matter, Alderman Gatsas.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated what he's referring to is an item in Committee on Finance...it was a motion that was made that was tabled, the Committee on Finance was made aware of that at the last meeting it held and no one elected to remove it from the table and it had to do with the budget which has already been adopted.

Alderman Gatsas stated it should still be on the table.

Mayor Baines replied no, the Clerk just advised you of what happened, it's not on the table because we've already passed the budget, it would be a moot point now.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated you're in the Board.

City Solicitor Clark stated the Finance Committee tabled the item, at the next meeting they took up a separate motion, they adopted a report and reported the budget out, there was nothing left before the Committee on Finance.

10. Resolutions:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) from Contingency to the Management Services line of Human Resources for consulting services (0350).”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Two Hundred Dollars (\$200,000) from Contingency to the Rent - Welfare line of Welfare (0869).”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2002.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted that the Resolutions be read by titles only, and it was so done.

Alderman Shea moved that the Resolutions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Guinta duly recorded in opposition.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to recess the regular meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

Mayor Baines called the meeting back to order.

13. A report of the Committee on Finance was presented recommending that Resolutions:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) from Contingency to the Management Services line of Human Resources for consulting services (0350).”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Two Hundred Dollars (\$200,000) from Contingency to the Rent - Welfare line of Welfare (0869).”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2002.”

ought to pass and be enrolled.

Alderman Lopez moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Finance.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas and Guinta duly recorded in opposition to the first Resolution listed.

14. Ordinance submitted on behalf of the Airport Director who has requested the Board suspend all rules and adopt the ordinance this evening.

“Establishing a special purchase procedure for Airport Construction Projects.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to suspend the rules and place this Ordinance on its final reading by title only at this time without referral to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading or the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration.

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted that the Ordinance be read by title only, and it was so done.

This Ordinance having had its final reading by title only, Alderman Osborne moved on passing same to be Ordained under suspension of the rules. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

15. Resolutions:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) from Contingency to the Management Services line of Human Resources for consulting services (0350).”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Two Hundred Dollars (\$200,000) from Contingency to the Rent - Welfare line of Welfare (0869).”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2002.”

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted that the Resolutions be read by titles only, and it was so done.

Alderman Garrity moved that the Resolutions pass and be enrolled. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas and Guinta duly recorded in opposition to the first Resolution listed.

16. Discussion regarding baseball feasibility study and selection of consultants.

Mr. Clougherty stated this is an item that has been on the agenda before. We’ve had discussions with Bill Jabjiniak and the Destination Manchester area and we want to remind the Board that at the last meeting there was approval for the team that your in discussions

with to come back with a proposal in sixty (60) days. If they come back with a proposal in 60 days and make recommendations the staff and the City has not independently verified the market. So, they could come back and tell you that a AA team will flourish but until you go out and hire your own consultant and independently verify that the staff is not going to be able to advise you. So, if there is going to be a decision on baseball in 60 days, we would ask that we have the authority to go forward and engage in a feasibility study. Now, the last time we were before the committee we talked about an estimate of about \$50,000 to do the study and it was \$50,000 at that time because we were looking at independent ball, single A...a whole range of things. Now, that the proposal before us is limited to AA we've gone back to the consultant and have received a revised cost estimate of \$30,000 to be able (in 60 days) to come before the Board and give you some independent verification of whether the market exists for what the group is telling you. So, at this point, we just want to remind the Board that if you don't approve this and they were to come back with something in 60 days then you'd turn to the staff and say is this something that you advise...we're going to say it's going to take us 60 from that point to go out and do an independent analysis. So, we're trying to save some time and have this approved this evening.

Mayor Baines stated your recommendation is to approve this this evening.

Mr. Clougherty replied if the Board wants to seriously consider it in 60 days.

Alderman Gatsas asked is this consultant going to tell us whether we should be spending tax dollars on this?

Mr. Clougherty replied this consultant...Alderman, every time we've done a major project whether it's Airport or Civic Center we have always tested independent of the developers whether a market exists. So, they are going to take a look and independently verify whether there is a market for AA baseball in Manchester.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you're suggesting, Kevin, that if the developer came in and was willing to put \$30 million on the table of their own money and not look for any subsidy from

the City you would still recommend to this Board to spend some \$30,000 to find out about a feasibility study whether AA, AAA, Major League baseball would work in Manchester.

Mr. Clougherty stated if somebody comes in and makes you that deal then I would say go forward. The chances of that deal coming as a result of the experience that we've seen and the preliminary discussions we've had is that there is always going to be some interest in having the City participate in some way and we want to make sure that we're verifying that.

Alderman Gatsas asked if the developer came in and said the project is a \$20 million project and we want the City to participate at 50% does it really matter if the consultant said Manchester, NH is the greatest location for a AA team?

Mr. Clougherty replied no but it does if he goes back and says it's the lousiest location for AA team.

Alderman Gatsas stated even if they said it was the best location, I would think that you would recommend that we wouldn't go forward if we had to spend tax dollars.

Mr. Clougherty stated the directive that this Board has given to the proposed development team is that there will not be tax dollars put at risk and my understanding is that they left this meeting with the understanding that if they brought in ancillary development like a hotel or something along those lines that that increment in the tax rate would offset their development costs and you may get a proposal like that coming back to you. If you get a proposal like that in response at 60 days you are going to want to have independently verified the market or...and this is what the staff is saying too. If you don't want to do the assessment at this time when the proposal comes back in then we would go out at that point and do the analysis, but understand it pushes everything back 60 days and if you're trying to have something open in the spring of 2004 you may not get there or it would be more difficult to get there because of the 60-day lapse in time.

Alderman Garrity asked, Kevin, again who says we have to do a feasibility study...bond counsel or...

Mr. Clougherty replied if you want to issue bonds the market is going to demand an independent...

Alderman Garrity stated I don't want to issue bonds, so if there's no taxpayer money involved do you recommend a feasibility study or not?

Mr. Clougherty replied if there is going to be no taxpayer money involved...

Alderman Garrity interjected including bonding...

Mr. Clougherty stated I expect that the proposal that will come back will involve the City in some way or another. It may involve the City in terms of the land that we have down at Singer Park. If you're going to commit any of the City's resources in the forms of bonds, in the form of land or any of that it seems to be reasonable that you go out and verify that the proposal that these people are giving to you is, in fact, achievable.

Mayor Baines stated we already know that our land will be involved in one way or another with this project, so that part of the equation has already been answered.

Alderman Shea stated I think this question came up before because if memory serves me correctly, I took that position a while back and I'll take the same position now. We will get more insight into the developer's plans once we know their plans and they lay them on the table. So, it would be in my judgment, premature to commit \$30,000 for a feasibility study...we've already had one a few years back which we...obviously, this is more conclusive and more pronounced and focused but nevertheless we would be able to find out from the developer more insights by waiting until we got their particular discussion on the table and then at that time if the need did develop and if we found the need at that time then we could have a consultant do a feasibility study. But, in essence, I would not vote for this

this evening for \$30,000, it's just too premature and it doesn't make much sense in my judgment.

Mayor Baines stated what I would suggest is that those who feel that way once we get a motion on the floor you vote no and those who agree with the Finance Officer vote yes and we could move on.

Alderman Lopez asked, Kevin, are we sending a signal, for example, if we voted for \$30,000...are we sending the signal that we are going to get an appraiser and do the study and everything to the people who want to build the stadium that we will be willing to participate.

Mr. Clougherty replied two things, Alderman. Our main concern as staff is timing. We don't want...where the Board has given them 60 days with a pretty strict directive to come back with some numbers and some items and then have them say to us what do you think and we're going to have to take another 60 days at that point. As long as the Board understands that there may be that delay and that the developer understands that we're okay with that. We just don't want to get to a point where they come in with a proposal and then they say things have changed in 60 days or whatever and the City has delayed this. We want to be up front on that. The other thing is the reason we're doing the study is to see if, just to test the veracity of the market and I don't think that anybody would see that...I hope they wouldn't misinterpret that as something in favor because if the feasibility study came back and said there is not a market for this then I'm going to come before you no matter what the developer says and says our study shows something that is in conflict, that there is not a market.

Mayor Baines asked can I get a motion on the floor, please.

Alderman O'Neil moved to authorize up to \$30,000 from the AirPark funds for the feasibility study. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked where is the funding coming from, Carol.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied originally there were funds that were going to be coming from the AirPark funds and that is where this is coming from.

Alderman Lopez stated two other points...if they walked in here and said we'll take it, we don't need your money we've saved ourselves the \$30,000, do you agree with that Kevin? I think you answered that before. But, the most important thing I think the developers and even Bill and Jay Taylor and Frank Thomas have indicated and in speaking with staff that the test they are taking down there now is going to be a big factor and if you had the test results tonight that might be a different story, but you don't have the test results. So, I wouldn't vote for this tonight either.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to authorize up to \$30,000 in AirPark funds for a feasibility study. Alderman Garrity, Thibault, Wihby, Gatsas, Guinta, Osborne, Lopez and Shea voted nay. Alderman Smith, Forest, Sysyn, Pinard, O'Neil and DeVries voted yes. The motion failed.

This being a special meeting of the Board, no further business was presented, and on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk